

# Interview Summary

Application No.  
08/847,967

Applicant(s)  
Goldwasser

Examiner  
Joseph W. Ricigliano

Group Art Unit  
1627



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Joseph W. Ricigliano (3) \_\_\_\_\_  
(2) Paul Stone (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Oct 5, 2000

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to applicant applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☒ Yes ☐ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ Was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: \_\_\_\_\_

Identification of prior art discussed:

Each of the art rejection set forth in the 3/17/00 office action was discussed.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicants' representative discussed the 9/25/00 amendment and attempted to distinguish the references cited from the instant claims. Applicants' assert that the Cavicchi reference teaches exploration of "process space," rather than "composition space." With respect to Chern et al applicants raised the issue that the materials prepared were not in predefined discrete regions but were continuous gradients. The examiner noted the reference teaches step gradients and that the material only needed to be discrete to the extent that diffusion did not occur. Hence, the reference still appeared relevant. Applicants also asserted distinguishing characteristics of their claims over Rolleston. In the discussion of the 112 first paragraph rejection, the examiner maintained that applicants' assertions were effectively: "can be made" and "can be used," in reference to in screening processes. Such arguments do not meet the 112 first requirement, as those arguments are an invitation to conduct undue experimentation, not a teaching of how to make and use.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.